

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

<p>HECTOR JARAMILLO,</p> <p style="padding-left: 150px;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>DAVE DAVEY,</p> <p style="padding-left: 150px;">Respondent.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>Case No. SACV 15-00136-SVW (KK)</p> <p>ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE</p>
---	--	--

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus, the records on file, and the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. The Court has engaged in a *de novo* review of those portions of the Report to which Petitioner has objected. The Court accepts the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge.

In his objections to the Report, Petitioner also requests an evidentiary hearing. However, in habeas proceedings, “an evidentiary hearing is not required on issues that can be resolved by reference to the state court record.” Totten v. Merkle, 137 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 1998); see also Earp v. Ornoski, 431 F.3d 1158, 1173 (9th Cir. 2005). “It is axiomatic that when issues can be resolved with reference to the state court record, an evidentiary hearing becomes nothing more than a futile exercise.” Totten, 137 F.3d at 1176. Here, the Magistrate Judge concluded all of Petitioner’s

1 claims could be resolved by reference to the state court record. Accordingly, the Court
2 denies Petitioner's request for an evidentiary hearing.

3 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Judgment be entered (1) denying the Petition
4 for a Writ of Habeas Corpus; and (2) dismissing this action with prejudice.

5
6 Dated: June 15, 2016

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen V. Wilson", is written over a horizontal line.

8 HONORABLE STEPHEN V. WILSON
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28